

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
MARK MAPLE
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
ENERGY DIVISION
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

MIDAMERICAN ENERGY COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 05-0745

NOVEMBER 8, 2007

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Mark Maple and my business address is Illinois Commerce
3 Commission, 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

5 A. I am employed by the Illinois Commerce Commission ("Commission") as a
6 Gas Engineer in the Engineering Department of the Energy Division.

7 Q. Please state your educational background.

8 A. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering and a
9 minor in Mathematics from Southern Illinois University - Carbondale. I
10 also received a Master's degree in Business Administration from the
11 University of Illinois at Springfield. Finally, I am a registered Professional
12 Engineer Intern in the State of Illinois.

13 Q. What are your duties and responsibilities as a Gas Engineer in the
14 Engineering Department?

15 A. My primary responsibilities and duties are in the performance of studies

16 and analyses dealing with the day-to-day, and long-term, operations and
17 planning of the gas utilities serving Illinois. For example, I review
18 purchased gas adjustment clause reconciliations, rate base additions,
19 levels of natural gas used for working capital, and utilities' applications for
20 Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity. I also perform utility
21 gas meter test shop audits.

22 Q. What is the purpose of this proceeding?

23 A. On November 22, 2005, the Commission initiated its annual reconciliation
24 of the Purchased Gas Adjustment ("PGA") for calendar year 2005, as filed
25 by MidAmerican Energy Company ("MidAmerican" or "Company"),
26 pursuant to Section 9-220 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act. This
27 investigation was initiated to determine whether MidAmerican's PGA
28 clause reflects actual costs of gas and gas transportation for calendar
29 year 2005 and whether those purchases were prudent.

30 Q. What is your assignment within this proceeding?

31 A. My assignment is to determine if MidAmerican's natural gas purchasing
32 decisions made during the reconciliation period were prudent.

34 Q. Did you discover any imprudent purchases during the reconciliation
35 period?

36 A. No. Using the Commission's criteria for prudence, I found no reason to
37 dispute the Company's assertion that all gas supply purchases were
38 prudently incurred during the reconciliation period.

39 Q. What criteria does the Commission use to determine prudence?

40 A. The Commission has defined prudence as:

41 **[...] that standard of care which a reasonable person**
42 **would be expected to exercise under the**
43 **circumstances encountered by utility management**
44 **at the time decisions had to be made. In determining**
45 **whether or not a judgment was prudently made, only**
46 **those facts available at the time the judgment was**
47 **exercised can be considered. Hindsight review is**
48 **impermissible.**

49 **Imprudence cannot be sustained by substituting**
50 **one's judgment for that of another. The prudence**
51 **standard recognizes that reasonable persons can**
52 **have honest differences of opinion without one or**
53 **the other necessarily being 'imprudent'.**
54 **(Commission v. Commonwealth Edison Company,**
55 **Docket No. 84-0395, Order dated October 7, 1987,**
56 **page 17).**

57

58 Q. What material did you review to determine the prudence of
59 MidAmerican's natural gas purchasing decisions during the
60 reconciliation period?

61 A. I reviewed the direct testimony of MidAmerican witnesses Roger
62 Miltenberger and David Badura. I also reviewed Company
63 responses to numerous Staff data requests that directly addressed
64 issues related to the prudence of MidAmerican's natural gas
65 purchasing.

66 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

67 A. Yes, it does.